

# **MEETING SUMMARY | March 27, 2013**

## **Santa Rosa Plain Technical Advisory Committee**

### **Meeting in Brief**

#### **Ongoing TAC Contributions to GMP**

The TAC continues to develop and improve various elements of the GMP. The Project Team subsequently incorporates TAC suggestions and presents new iterations for review. The TAC revisited and made additional contributions to section 4 (Basin Management Objectives) and section 5.1 (Stakeholder Involvement). All sections developed by the TAC are taken to the Panel for full consideration and further refinement.

#### **Management Components List Discussion**

The TAC initiated general discussion of GMP management components. An introduced list of headings identified at previous Panel and TAC meetings served as the basis for discussion. The TAC noted a range of considerations upon review of the initial headings. Once the management components are completed, the TAC will work to prioritize alternatives and develop a schedule, budget and implementation plan.

#### **Groundwater Management Presentations**

Project Consultant Tim Parker shared several case studies of managed aquifer recharge and groundwater management in LA, Orange and Kern Counties as a means to demonstrate successful recharge programs from around the state and stimulate thinking on potential management alternatives for the Santa Rosa Plain Watershed. Marcus Trotta provided a brief overview of two regional enhanced recharge studies currently being conducted by the Sonoma County Water Agency with local partners, and recently presented at the February Panel meeting.

<http://www.scwa.gov/srgroundwater/>

#### **Next Meetings**

Upcoming TAC Meeting Dates: April 24, 2013 and May 22, 2013 at the Sonoma County Water Agency office, 404 Aviation Blvd, Santa Rosa.

#### **Action Items**

<b>Timeframe</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Action Item</b>
Early April	Project Team	Send USGS circular documents to TAC

#### **Review of Incorporated TAC Contributions to GMP**

The TAC continues to develop and improve various elements of the GMP. The Project Team subsequently incorporates TAC suggestions and presents new iterations for review. The TAC re-visited sections worked on during February meeting, including the section 4 (Basin Management Objectives or BMOs) and section 5.1 (Stakeholder Involvement). All sections developed by the TAC are eventually taken to the Panel for full consideration, discussion and further refinement. The TAC may then review and consider Panel contributions. Discussion of the latest iterations of sections 4 and 5.1 secured the following feedback:

#### *General commentary*

- Each GMP section may benefit from summary text presented at the outset
- An executive summary should stand alone and serve to provide a brief overview of the background, purpose and contents of the GMP; distinct sections are not meant to be stand alone documents
- Brochures or something like the groundwater primer may be good for the “general public” whereas the “interested public” may require more detailed information
- Ensure clear definition of terms; consider a glossary of key words and concepts
- Remember the TAC has bigger issues to address than wordsmithing and copyediting every section; defer to the Project Consultant on writing issues as appropriate

#### *Basin Management Objectives*

- General comment – Redundant language should be consolidated and refined
- BMO 3 – Second sentence reads awkwardly and needs clarification
- BMO 5 – Ensure second sentence is clear re: streams gaining flow

#### *Stakeholder Involvement*

- Include reference to public schools as a key stakeholder group

### **Initial Management Components List Discussion**

The TAC initiated general discussion of GMP management components. An introduced list of headings, derived from previous Panel and TAC meetings and included in the table of contents for section 5.1, served as the basis for discussion. The TAC considered examples of projects and activities that could fall under each heading. Once the management components are completed, the TAC will work to prioritize alternatives and develop a schedule, budget and implementation plan. The USGS study and model will help analyze various alternatives and determine benefits for groundwater management in the Santa Rosa Plain Watershed. The TAC noted the following considerations for the initial headings:

#### *Watershed approach*

- The GMP encompasses a watershed approach (as memorialized in the GMP area label – the Santa Rosa Plain Watershed); management components speak to specific actions and alternatives; early sections will lay out the larger watershed vision
- Watershed issues may also be addressed in the integrated groundwater management component or the conservation and efficiency component

#### *Surface water/groundwater quality protection*

- Need to find an inclusive way to address surface water/groundwater interaction; surface water quality could be a distinct heading or part of section 5.3
- Surface water/groundwater interaction and protection generally needs more focus

#### *Integrated groundwater management*

- Consider a sub-section on growth and development; look for opportunities to integrate groundwater management and land use planning
- Consider the nexus between energy use and water use, yet do so within the scope of groundwater management planning

#### *Well owners*

- Link well owners to effective implementation of GMP management components; make sure to address unincorporated areas

- Build a database of well owners and find ways to share information
- Consider voluntary well owner inspections to prevent contamination

#### *Water reuse and recycling*

- Maintain sensitivity to public perception of agricultural issues

#### *Conjunctive use*

- Consider conjunctive use as a distinct management heading

#### *Interaction with other agencies*

- Consider how GMP implementation requires interaction with other agencies; alternatively, cross-agency/program interaction could be explored as a distinct heading or in section 5.1 (partnerships)

### **Statewide Managed Aquifer Recharge & Groundwater Management Efforts**

Project Consultant Tim Parker shared several case studies of managed aquifer recharge and groundwater management in LA, Orange and Kern Counties as a means to demonstrate successful recharge programs from around the state and stimulate thinking on potential recharge and management alternatives for the Santa Rosa Plain Watershed. Excessive pumping decades ago in LA County caused groundwater overdraft, seawater intrusion, and triggered efforts toward a variety of management solutions, including the development of seawater barrier wells, managed aquifer recharge and water extraction controls. Orange County also faces numerous water use challenges and has realized management success through major investment in groundwater storage and replenishment programs. In Kern County, lands purchased by the Department of Water Resources eventually led to the establishment of the Kern Water Bank. This program has increased access to water supplies, enhanced infrastructure that supports recharge, recovery and conveyance, and improved groundwater quality.

### **Sonoma County Enhanced Recharge Efforts**

Marcus Trotta provided a brief overview of two regional enhanced recharge studies currently being conducted by the Sonoma County Water Agency with local partners, and recently presented at the February Panel meeting. The studies came about as recommended strategies from the Sonoma Valley GMP and are part of a portfolio of projects that aim to improve management of surface and groundwater in Sonoma County. The first study, storm water management and groundwater recharge, is exploring ways to manage storm water that limit damage from flooding and promote groundwater recharge. The second study, groundwater banking feasibility, seeks to capture and convey wintertime water from the Russian river for storage in the Santa Rosa Plain and Sonoma Valley groundwater basins for subsequent use during needed times (peak summer demand periods, droughts, etc.). The overall objective for both studies is to help improve water supply reliability, operational reliability and resiliency during extreme events such as drought, earthquakes etc. Open discussion by the TAC noted the following commentary and considerations:

- A cost/benefit analysis may help determine project values, which will be done for the banking project
- Pilot studies use existing wells can help reduce initial costs of a groundwater banking program
- Wintertime testing of Russian River source water for a potential groundwater banking program indicates the availability of very high quality water for recharge;

source water quality data has been generated from one-time sampling for several key parameters and decades of water quality data from Russian River drinking water facilities

- The stormwater management/groundwater recharge study is focused in areas where recharge is currently occurring, not looking at new sources
- The scoping study indicates the most promising projects for stormwater detention/groundwater recharge at 8 or 10 different sites
- Interaction with the Sonoma County Agriculture and Open Space District may help identify new lands that support recharge
- Next steps include identification of additional funding, ongoing data collection and feasibility analysis

### **Information Repository**

Comments resurfaced on the need for the SCWA to maintain an information repository that not only highlights project activities but also provides links to other useful resources related to groundwater management planning. Establishment of a major information repository may be considered as a distinct GMP objective. Alternatively, information sharing may be part of BMO 1 or 3. Some described the usefulness of a kind of “one-stop-information-shop” that ensures widespread understanding and support of the GMP from the general public, planners and developers.

### **USGS Report Update**

The USGS characterization report is now expected towards the end of May 2013. Fact sheets and other material will be developed to support public outreach and dissemination of the report. A series of meetings will also be held to provide informational presentations, answer questions and secure public feedback.

### **TAC Meeting Attendees**

#### **TAC Members**

Kevin Cullinen  
Rocky Vogler  
Brock Dolman  
Gary Mickelson  
Lloyd Iverson  
Rue Furch  
Mark Calhoon  
Bob Anderson  
Michael Burns

#### **Project Team**

Project Manager, Marcus Trotta  
Technical Consultant, Tim Parker  
TAC Facilitator, Rich Wilson

#### **TAC Visitors**

Jennifer Larocque  
Karl Adelman